

REMARKS

1. The applicant has checked the reference number “4” in the Fig.2, and found it is properly used, and therefore, it should not need change.

The “precutting means” are not longer used in the claims amended in this response, therefore, reason for modification of the draw, which was explained in this office action, no longer exists. Therefore, the drawing should not need change.

2. The claims have been amended such that the claims have proper antecedent basis in the specification.

3. The claims have been amended to eliminate the new matter that the examiner pointed out.

4. The present invention is different from Menter’s invention in both principle, structure, and functions.

Menter’s invention does not have the floating arms of the present invention. Menter’s invention has only the slits. The function of the slits is to “allow the rapid passage of excreta” (col. 2, lns. 35, 36), while, the floating arms of the present invention is to prevent the “rapid passage of excreta” by damper of the impact of the falling feces. The principle of the present invention is just the opposite of that of the Menter’s.

Slits are the openings purposely created, while present invention provides substantially complete coverage, and openings are not desirable. The material left between the slits of the Menter’s have two ends fixed. This is very different from the floating arms of the present invention. The material between the slits of the Menter’s can not move as the floating arms of the present invention, and therefore do not have the functions that the floating arms of the present invention have.

5. The present invention has not made any claims on “slippery surface”. The issue of using wax to create a slippery surface is irrelevant to the present application.